

Docket No.: 2328-023RI

COPY

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of	: : EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
DUANE C. GATES	: : Response after Final Rejection
	: Confirmation No. 9066
U.S. Patent Application No. 09/534,814	: Group Art Unit: 3742
Filed: March 22, 2000	: Examiner: MARK H. PASCHALL
For: SEGMENTED COIL FOR GENERATING PLASMA IN PLASMA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT	

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL REJECTION

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This paper is submitted in reply to the Office Action mailed March 22, 2004, which was made Final.

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS BEING FACSIMILE-
LE TRANSMITTED TO THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
ON THE DATE SHOWN BELOW
G. Michael John
TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PERSON MAKING CERTIFICATION
G. Michael John 5-24-04
SIGNATURE DATE
703 872-9306 (5pages)
FACSIMILE NUMBER

09/19/2004 07:49 4107564622

ALLAN LOWE

PAGE 02

ARGUMENT

Section 714.13 of the MPEP states:

If an applicant initially replies within 2 months from the date of mailing of any final rejection setting a 3-month shortened statutory period for reply and the Office does not mail an advisory action until after the end of the 3-month shortened statutory period, the period for reply for purposes of determining the amount of any extension fee will be the date on which the Office mails the advisory action . . .

Applicant filed the response to the March 22, 2004 final rejection on Monday, May 24, 2004, that is within the two month period. The Office failed to issue an advisory action within the shortened statutory period set for response set under 37 CFR 1.136 and has still failed to issue an office action within six months from the date of mailing of the final office action. Because Applicant, per 37 CFR 1.136, only has six months from mailing date of the final rejection, in this instance September 22, 2004, to preserve an application from abandonment, Applicant has submitted a Notice of Appeal along with a petition for extension of time for response therein of three months. Applicant is not at fault for the delay associated with the extension and is therefore entitled to full refund of the \$950 extension fees.

Based on the foregoing, a refund of the extension fee is in order.

Respectfully submitted,
LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER,

LLP

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS BEING FACSIMI-
LE TRANSMITTED TO THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
ON THE DATE SHOWN BELOW

Maria Anderson
TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PERSON SIGNING CERTIFICATION
Maria Anderson 9-22-04
SIGNATURE DATE
703-872-9206
FACSIMILE NUMBER


Allan M. Lowe
Registration No. 19,641